

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of:
Dettinger et al.

Serial No.: 10/787,479

Confirmation No.: 6996

§
§
§
§
§
§

Filed: February 26, 2004

Group Art Unit: 2176

Examiner: Nathan Hillery

For: TOOL FOR CONFIGURING AVAILABLE FUNCTIONS OF AN APPLICATION

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to fax number 571-273-8300 to the attention of Examiner Nathan Hillery, or electronically transmitted via EFS-Web, on the date shown below:

August 25, 2008
Date

/Joseph Jong/
Joseph Jong

Dear Sir:

APPEAL BRIEF

Applicants submit this Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on appeal from the decision of the Examiner of Group Art Unit 2176 dated March 21, 2008, finally rejecting claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24 and 25. The final rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24 and 25 is appealed. This Appeal Brief is believed to be timely since it is transmitted by the due date of August 23, 2008, as set by the filing of a Notice of Appeal on June 23, 2008.

Please charge the fee of \$510.00 for filing this brief to:

Deposit Account No. 09-0465 / ROC920030330US1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Identification Page.....	1
2.	Table of Contents	2
3.	Real Party in Interest	3
4.	Related Appeals and Interferences	4
5.	Status of Claims	5
6.	Status of Amendments	6
7.	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	7
8.	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	12
9.	Arguments	13
10.	Conclusion	20
11.	Claims Appendix	21
12.	Evidence Appendix	25
13.	Related Proceedings Appendix	26

Real Party in Interest

The present application has been assigned to International Business Machines Corporation, Armonk, New York.

Related Appeals and Interferences

Applicants assert that no other appeals or interferences are known to the Applicants, the Applicants' legal representative, or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24, and 25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 were originally presented in the application. Claims 24 and 25 have been added during prosecution. Claims 4, 7-10, 14, and 16-23 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24 and 25 stand finally rejected as discussed below. The final rejections of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24 and 25 are appealed. The pending claims are shown in the attached Claims Appendix.

Status of Amendments

All claim amendments have been entered by the Examiner, including amendments to the claims proposed after the final rejection.

Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

A. CLAIM 1 – INDEPENDENT

Claim 1 is directed to a method for configuring web pages. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 1 – 2. The method includes receiving a request for a web page, where the web page contains displayable content. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 2; page 8, paragraph [0029], lines 2 – 6; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 3 – 6; Figure 6, Item: 604. The displayable content includes user-selectable elements which a user may use to invoke one or more executable functions. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 2 – 4; page 6, paragraph [0024], lines 8 – 9; pages 6 – 7, paragraph [0025]; Figures 1 – 4, Items: 112, 202, and 604. The method further includes providing the web page with the displayable content. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 4; page 8, paragraph [0029], lines 2 – 6; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 9 – 10; Figure 6, Item: 604.

The method also includes parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 5; pages 8 – 9, paragraph [0029], lines 13 – 17; Figures 2, 4, and 6, Items: 202 and 604. Yet further, the method includes disabling at least a portion of the user-selectable elements according to a pre-defined transform definition to produce a re-configured web page and returning the re-configured web page for display. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 5 – 8; page 7, paragraph [0026]; pages 7 – 8, paragraph [0028], lines 1 – 14; pages 9 – 10, paragraph [0030]; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 6 – 17; Figures 1 – 6, Items: 202, 508, 604, and 606. The pre-defined transform definition is an XSL transform that is defined for the web page specifying user-selectable elements to be disabled, and applied by an XSL transform engine. See *Original Specification*, page 7, paragraph [0026]; pages 9 – 10, paragraph [0030]; Figures 1, 5, and 6, Item: 508. Accordingly, the one or more executable functions corresponding to the portion of the user-selectable elements is made unavailable to the user viewing the re-configured web page without setting values of variables within an underlying application code. See

Original Specification, page 8, paragraph [0028], lines 14 – 16; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 17 – 20; Figures 1 – 6, Items: 108, 112, 202, and 606.

B. CLAIM 11 - INDEPENDENT

Claim 11 is directed to a computer readable storage medium containing a program which, when executed, performs an operation for configuring web pages. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 1 – 2; pages 4 – 5, paragraph [0020]. The operation includes receiving a request for a web page, where the web page contains displayable content. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 2; page 8, paragraph [0029], lines 2 – 6; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 3 – 6; Figure 6, Item: 604. The displayable content includes user-selectable elements which a user may use to invoke one or more executable functions. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 2 – 4; page 6, paragraph [0024], lines 8 – 9; pages 6 – 7, paragraph [0025]; Figures 1 – 4, Items: 112, 202, and 604. The operation further includes providing the web page with the displayable content. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 4; page 8, paragraph [0029], lines 2 – 6; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 9 – 10; Figure 6, Item: 604.

The operation also includes parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 5; pages 8 – 9, paragraph [0029], lines 13 – 17; Figures 2, 4, and 6, Items: 202 and 604. Yet further, the operation includes disabling at least a portion of the user-selectable elements according to a pre-defined transform definition to produce a re-configured web page and returning the re-configured web page for display. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 5 – 8; page 7, paragraph [0026]; pages 7 – 8, paragraph [0028], lines 1 – 14; pages 9 – 10, paragraph [0030]; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 6 – 17; Figures 1 – 6, Items: 202, 508, 604, and 606. The pre-defined transform definition is an XSL transform that is defined for the web page specifying user-selectable elements to be disabled, and applied by an XSL transform engine. See *Original Specification*, page 7, paragraph [0026]; pages 9 – 10, paragraph [0030]; Figures 1, 5, and 6, Item: 508.

Accordingly, the one or more executable functions corresponding to the portion of the user-selectable elements is made unavailable to the user viewing the re-configured web page without setting values of variables within an underlying application code. See *Original Specification*, page 8, paragraph [0028], lines 14 – 16; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 17 – 20; Figures 1 – 6, Items: 108, 112, 202, and 606.

C. CLAIM 24 - INDEPENDENT

Claim 24 is directed to a method for configuring web pages. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 1 – 2. The method includes receiving at a server side, via a network connection, a request for a web page from a browser of a remotely located client computer. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 2; page 6, paragraph [0024], lines 1 – 8; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 3 – 6; Figures 1 and 6, Items: 102, 104, 106, and 604. The web page contains displayable content which includes user-selectable elements for invoking one or more executable functions by a user. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 2 – 4; page 6, paragraph [0024], lines 8 – 9; pages 6 – 7, paragraph [0025]; page 8, paragraph [0029], lines 2 – 6; Figures 1 – 4, Items: 112, 202, and 604. The user-selectable elements are graphical user interface elements. See *Original Specification*, pages 6 – 7, paragraph [0025]; Figures 2 and 4, Item: 202. The method further includes providing the web page with the displayable content. See *Original Specification*, page 8, paragraph [0029], lines 2 – 6; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 9 – 10; Figure 6, Item: 604.

The method also includes parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 5; pages 8 – 9, paragraph [0029], lines 13 – 17; Figures 2, 4, and 6, Items: 202 and 604. Yet further, the method includes disabling at least a portion of the user-selectable elements according to a pre-defined transform definition to produce a re-configured web page and returning the re-configured web page for display. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 5 – 8; page 7, paragraph [0026]; pages 7 – 8, paragraph [0028],

lines 1 – 14; pages 9 – 10, paragraph [0030]; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 6 – 17; Figures 1 – 6, Items: 202, 508, 604, and 606. The pre-defined transform definition is an XSL transform that is defined for the web page specifying user-selectable elements to be disabled, and applied by an XSL transform engine. See *Original Specification*, page 7, paragraph [0026]; pages 9 – 10, paragraph [0030]; Figures 1, 5, and 6, Item: 508. Accordingly, the one or more executable functions corresponding to the portion of the user-selectable elements is made unavailable to the user viewing the re-configured web page without setting values of variables within an underlying application code. See *Original Specification*, page 8, paragraph [0028], lines 14 – 16; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 17 – 20; Figures 1 – 6, Items: 108, 112, 202, and 606.

D. CLAIM 25 - INDEPENDENT

Claim 25 is directed to a computer readable storage medium containing a program which, when executed, performs an operation for configuring web pages. The operation is performed by a server computer. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 1 – 2; pages 4 – 5, paragraph [0020]. The operation includes receiving, via a network connection, a request for a web page from a browser of a remotely located client computer. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 2; page 6, paragraph [0024], lines 1 – 8; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 3 – 6; Figures 1 and 6, Items: 102, 104, 106, and 604. The web page contains displayable content which includes user-selectable elements for invoking one or more executable functions by a user. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 2 – 4; page 6, paragraph [0024], lines 8 – 9; pages 6 – 7, paragraph [0025]; page 8, paragraph [0029], lines 2 – 6; Figures 1 – 4, Items: 112, 202, and 604. The user-selectable elements are graphical user interface elements. See *Original Specification*, pages 6 – 7, paragraph [0025]; Figures 2 and 4, Item: 202. The operation further includes providing the web page with the displayable content. See *Original Specification*, page 8, paragraph [0029], lines 2 – 6; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 9 – 10; Figure 6, Item: 604.

The operation also includes parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], line 5; pages 8 – 9, paragraph [0029], lines 13 – 17; Figures 2, 4, and 6, Items: 202 and 604. Yet further, the operation includes disabling at least a portion of the user-selectable elements according to a pre-defined transform definition to produce a re-configured web page and returning the re-configured web page for display. See *Original Specification*, page 2, paragraph [0008], lines 5 – 8; page 7, paragraph [0026]; pages 7 – 8, paragraph [0028], lines 1 – 14; pages 9 – 10, paragraph [0030]; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 6 – 17; Figures 1 – 6, Items: 202, 508, 604, and 606. The pre-defined transform definition is an XSL transform that is defined for the web page specifying user-selectable elements to be disabled, and applied by an XSL transform engine. See *Original Specification*, page 7, paragraph [0026]; pages 9 – 10, paragraph [0030]; Figures 1, 5, and 6, Item: 508. Accordingly, the one or more executable functions corresponding to the portion of the user-selectable elements is made unavailable to the user viewing the re-configured web page without setting values of variables within an underlying application code. See *Original Specification*, page 8, paragraph [0028], lines 14 – 16; page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 17 – 20; Figures 1 – 6, Items: 108, 112, 202, and 606.

Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wiesehuegel et al.* (U.S. Publication 2002/0128949, hereinafter, "*Wiesehuegel*") as applied to claims 1 and 11, and further in view of *Keating* (U.S. Publication 2002/0052895, hereinafter, "*Keating*") and *Hogan* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0187093, hereinafter, "*Hogan*").

ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wiesehuegel* as applied to claims 1 and 11, and further in view of *Keating* and *Hogan*.

The Applicable Law

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2141. Establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness begins with first resolving the factual inquiries of *Graham v. John Deere Co.* 383 U.S. 1 (1966). The factual inquiries are as follows:

- (A) determining the scope and content of the prior art;
- (B) ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art;
- (C) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the art; and
- (D) considering any objective indicia of nonobviousness.

Once the *Graham* factual inquiries are resolved, the Examiner must determine whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The key to supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is the clear articulation of the reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The analysis supporting such a rejection must be explicit. “[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *In re Kahn*, 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006), cited with approval in *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 126 S. Ct. 2965 (2006); see also MPEP §2141.

The References

Wiesehuegel is generally directed to a computer system and a method communication between a manufacturer or service provider with a plurality of traders regarding available goods and services, quantities of available items, and conditions to be met for purchase of the available items (See e.g., *Wiesehuegel*, Abstract, paragraph [0031]). Broker profiles are applied to available items to produce offerings to bidders, where the broker profiles are established based on contractual arrangements between the brokers and manufactures. Accordingly, particular offerings displayed to a particular bidder include biddings that the bidder is entitled to bid on. The offerings may also include biddings that the bidder is entitled to review only. To bid on an offering, the bidder clicks on a corresponding bid button. If the bidder is only entitled to review the offering, then the corresponding bid button is disabled (See e.g., *Wiesehuegel*, paragraphs [0065] – [0067]).

Keating is generally directed to a system and a method for generalizing content in formatted documents. More specifically, similar elements of a web page are treated in the same manner, so a dynamic webpage may be processed using a guide. A particular element may occur in the web page multiple times without disturbing the automatic processing of the webpage using the guide (See e.g., *Keating*, Abstract, paragraph [0012]).

Hogan is generally directed to a translation method for translating source information, such as configuration information of one computer system, into target information, such as configuration information of another computer system, using knowledge arising from relations between elements of the source information. The method includes: obtaining information from sources; applying pattern matching rules to the information to obtain a first transformed version of the information; transforming the information using user input to obtain a second transformed version of the information; and expressing the first transformed version and the second transformed version in a destination system (See e.g., *Hogan*, Abstract, paragraphs [0006] and [0018]).

The Examiner's Argument

The Examiner rejects Applicants' independent claims 1, 11, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) asserting that combination of *Wiesehuegel*, *Keating*, and *Hogan* teaches all elements and limitations of each of Applicants' independent claims 1, 11, 24, and 25. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that:

- 1) *Wiesehuegel*, paragraph [0067], teaches Applicants' steps of "parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements" and "produc[ing] a re-configured web page" (See *Final Office Action*: page 3).
- 2) *Wiesehuegel*, paragraph [0066], teaches Applicants' step of "returning the re-configured web page for display" (See *Final Office Action*: page 3).
- 3) Combination of *Wiesehuegel*, *Keating*, and *Hogan* teaches Applicants' independent claims 24 and 25 because the claims incorporate substantially similar matter as independent claims 1 and 11 (See *Final Office Action*: page 6).
- 4) Applicants' argument that *Wiesehuegel* utilizes server-side processing as oppose to client-side processing, and consequently may not teach or suggest some of the elements of Applicants' claim 1 and 11 are meritless because Applicants do not expressly claim the difference (See *Advisory Action*: page 2).

Applicants' Response to the Examiner's Argument

- 1) The Examiner asserts that paragraph [0067] of *Wiesehuegel* teaches Applicants' elements of "parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements" and "produc[ing] a re-configured web page." Applicants disagree.

Paragraph [0067] states:

"For example, in the preferred embodiment, a web page including a place bid button or icon is sent to the bidder including the information about the products to which he is entitled to bid normally (77). If the bidder decides to place a bid, he may click on the bid button, which will provide him with a bid form to complete with bid price and quantity. However, for items which a bidder is only allowed to read as a guest, the bid button is either disabled ('grayed out') and provided with an informational message such as 'Sorry, you are not allowed to bid on this item at this time,' or the bid button is removed from the web page (79) entirely."

As evidenced from the above recited portion and the *Wiesehuegel* disclosure as a whole, the *Wiesehuegel* arrangement relies on the generally known server-side processing technology of generating web pages based on state information. For example, this is supported by the fact that *Wiesehuegel* discloses Java servlets, Java Server Pages, and/or Microsoft's Active Server Pages as implementing technologies. Each of these technologies is a server side technology. One skilled in the art would recognize that to display or disable buttons or to provide an informational message on a web page, as described in the above recited portion of *Wiesehuegel*, *Wiesehuegel* puts corresponding HTML attributes into web pages generated based off of state information within the server application. The created web pages are provided to clients (brokers) and displayed. However, this arrangement does not include producing a re-configured web-page. A web-page is simply created on the server side, provided to the client side, and displayed to the client.

In contrast, according to Applicants' claims 1 and 11, a web page is requested, provided, parsed, and re-configured, and only then is the re-configured web page displayed. The provided web-page serves as a template that is modified at the client side. More specifically, the web page is parsed to identify the user-selectable elements, such as buttons, and then re-configured according to an XSL transform definition. This is entirely different from the server side technology disclosed by *Wiesehuegel*.

Furthermore, *Wiesehuegel* does not even mention "parsing." Because *Wiesehuegel* discloses the server side technology of generating web pages, "parsing" is not inherent from *Wiesehuegel* any more than from any other general purpose web based application, where parsing is performed for rendering a web page. The latter is not the same as "parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements" because parsing for rendering a web page does not identify particular elements forming the web page, but instead, processes all the elements forming the webpage.

Moreover, one of the goals of the *Wiesehuegel* arrangement is to provide a web page to a broker (client) that does not contain any sensitive information. Thus, application servers of the client side are provided with communications capability to an authenticating server of the server side, where the sensitive information is stored on the server side. *Wiesehuegel's* "preferred embodiment ... insure[s] that product offerings

are made available only to entitled brokers" (see *Wiesehuegel*, paragraph [0061]). Therefore, even assuming that *Wiesehuegel* suggests parsing to identify the user-selectable elements, to prevent sensitive information from being inadvertently disclosed, such parsing must be performed at the server side, before the web page is provided to the client. In contrast, in Applicants' claimed arrangement the web page is parsed after such web page has been provided to the client side. Applicants' claims 1 and 11 expressly recite the step of "providing the web page with the displayable content." Accordingly, *Wiesehuegel* fails to disclose at least "parsing the web-page to identify the user-selectable elements," "produc[ing] a re-configured web page," and "returning the re-configured web page for display," as recited in independent claims 1 and 11, and thus a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to independent claims 1 and 11, and claims depending from claims 1 and 11, is not established.

2) The Examiner asserts that paragraph [0066] of *Wiesehuegel* teaches Applicants' element of "providing the re-configured web page for display." Applicants disagree.

Paragraph [0066] states:

However, for those items to which he is entitled to view information but restricted from bidding (700), the information (or a subset of the information) regarding the items will be displayed (79) with all bidding actions disabled or with no bidding actions given.

As evidenced from the above recited portion, *Wiesehuegel* does not expressly disclose that the re-configured web page is provided for display. Rather, *Wiesehuegel* merely describes certain information being displayed and that bidding actions may be disabled or not displayed at all. However, the cited portion does not describe a technology used to implement such displaying.

Moreover, using a re-configured web page to display the certain information and disabled bidding actions is not inherent from *Wiesehuegel*. For example, such a webpage may be a web page newly generated based on attribute values. Because the newly generated web page is a new web page generated without use of another web page, such a web page may not be equated to Applicants' re-configured web-page.

The plain meaning of the term “re-configured web page” is that an original web page has to be modified to produce the re-configured web page.

Furthermore, as discussed above, the only technologies disclosed by *Wiesehuegel* are Java servlets, Java Server Pages, and/or Microsoft’s Active Server Pages. Such technologies do not re-configure web pages, but rather use attributes to generate web pages for a particular situation, such as web pages displaying disabled buttons.

3) The Examiner asserts that *Wiesehuegel* teaches Applicants’ independent claims 24 and 25 because the claims incorporate substantially similar matter to the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 11. Applicants disagree.

Applicants’ independent claims 24 and 25 recite several elements that are not present in independent claims 1 and 11. For example, both claims recite: “wherein the user-selectable elements are graphical user interface elements and wherein the request is received, via a network connection, from a browser executing on a remotely located client computer” (emphasis added). Neither of the underlined elements is recited in independent claim 1 or 11.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2141. “[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *In re Kahn*, 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006), cited with approval in *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 126 S. Ct. 2965 (2006); see also MPEP §2141. Accordingly, because claim 24 and 25 include elements that are not present in independent claims 1 and 11, or claims depended from claims 1 and 11, the Examiner does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 24 and 25.

4) The Examiner suggests that Applicants’ arguments have no value because the difference between the client and server side processing is not expressly claimed. Applicants disagree.

Applicants do not argue that the term “client side processing” in itself differentiates Applicant’s claimed arrangements from *Wiesehuegel*. As discussed above, Applicants argue that because *Wiesehuegel* discloses using only the server side processing, *Wiesehuegel* simply not cannot teach or suggest certain limitations of Applicants’ claims 1 and 11. These limitations are expressly recited in claims 1 and 11 and include: “parsing the web-page to identify the user-selectable elements,” “produc[ing] a re-configured web page,” and “returning the re-configured web page for display.” Accordingly, contrary to the Examiner’s suggestions, and at least for the reasons discussed above, *Wiesehuegel* does not meet these limitations.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner errs in finding that claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 15, 24, and 25 are unpatentable over *Wiesehuegel* in view of *Keating* and *Hogan* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Appellant(s)

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Previously Presented) A method for configuring web pages, comprising:

receiving a request for a web page comprising displayable content including user-selectable elements through which a user invokes one or more executable functions;

providing the web page with the displayable content;

parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements;

disabling at least a portion of the user-selectable elements on the basis of a pre-defined transform definition to produce a re-configured web page, wherein the pre-defined transform definition is an XSL transform defined for the web page, applied by an XSL transform engine, and specifying the portion of the user-selectable elements to be disabled, thereby making the one or more executable functions corresponding to the portion of the user-selectable elements unavailable to the user viewing the re-configured web page without setting values of variables within an underlying application code; and then

returning the re-configured web page for display.
2. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the portion of the user-selectable elements for which the one or more executable functions are made unavailable remain visible while the one or more executable functions are unavailable.
3. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein disabling comprises removing the portion of the user-selectable elements from the web page prior to returning the re-configured web page.
4. (Canceled)
5. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the user-selectable elements are graphical user interface elements.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the request is issued by a web browser.

7-10. (Canceled)

11. (Previously Presented) A computer readable storage medium containing a program which, when executed, performs an operation for configuring web pages, the operation comprising:

receiving a request for a web page comprising displayable content including user-selectable elements through which a user invokes one or more executable functions;

providing the web page with the displayable content;

parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements;

disabling at least a portion of the user-selectable elements on the basis of a pre-defined transform definition to produce a re-configured web page, wherein the pre-defined transform definition is an XSL transform defined for the web page, applied by an XSL transform engine, and specifying the portion of the user-selectable elements to be disabled, thereby making the one or more executable functions corresponding to the portion of the user-selectable elements unavailable to the user viewing the re-configured web page without setting values of variables within an underlying application code; and then

returning the re-configured web page for display.

12. (Previously presented) The computer readable storage medium of claim 11, wherein the portion of the user-selectable elements for which the one or more executable functions are made unavailable remain visible while the one or more executable functions are unavailable.

13. (Previously presented) The computer readable storage medium of claim 11, wherein disabling comprises removing the portion of the user-selectable elements from the web page prior to returning the re-configured web page.

14. (Canceled)

15. (Previously presented) The computer readable storage medium of claim 11, wherein the user-selectable elements are graphical user interface elements.

16-23. (Canceled)

24. (Previously Presented) A method for configuring web pages, comprising:

at a server computer:

receiving a request for a web page comprising displayable content including user-selectable elements through which a user invokes one or more executable functions; wherein the user-selectable elements are graphical user interface elements and wherein the request is received, via a network connection, from a browser executing on a remotely located client computer;

providing the web page with the displayable content;

parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements;

disabling at least a portion of the user-selectable elements on the basis of a pre-defined transform definition to produce a re-configured web page, thereby making the one or more executable functions corresponding to the portion of the user-selectable elements unavailable to the user viewing the re-configured web page without setting values of variables within an underlying application code; wherein the pre-defined transform definition is an XSL transform defined for the web page, applied by an XSL transform engine, and specifying the portion of the user-selectable elements to be disabled; and then

returning the re-configured web page to the browser for display.

25. (Previously Presented) A computer readable storage medium containing a program which, when executed, performs an operation for configuring web pages, the operation being performed by a server computer and comprising:

receiving a request for a web page comprising displayable content including user-selectable elements through which a user invokes one or more executable functions; wherein the user-selectable elements are graphical user interface elements and wherein the request is received, via a network connection, from a browser executing on a remotely located client computer;

providing the web page with the displayable content;

parsing the web page to identify the user-selectable elements;

disabling at least a portion of the user-selectable elements on the basis of a pre-defined transform definition to produce a re-configured web page, thereby making the one or more executable functions corresponding to the portion of the user-selectable elements unavailable to the user viewing the re-configured web page without setting values of variables within an underlying application code; wherein the pre-defined transform definition is an XSL transform defined for the web page, applied by an XSL transform engine, and specifying the portion of the user-selectable elements to be disabled; and then

returning the re-configured web page to the browser for display.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.